

### REMARKS

Claims 1-3 and 6 have been cancelled. Claims 4-5 and 7-8 have been amended to clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. New claims 9-10 have been added. Claims 4-5 and 7-10 are pending.

The Examiner has indicated that claim 6 contains allowable subject matter. Independent claim 4 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 6. It is therefore believed that claim 4 is allowable. As claims 5 and 7 depend on claim 4, it is believed that claims 5 and 7 are also allowable.

Claims 4-5 and 7-8 have been rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting. It is believed that the Terminal Disclaimer filed herewith is sufficient to overcome the double patenting rejection.

Claim 7 has been amended to correct the informality noted by the Examiner.


Claim 8 has been amended to correct the insufficient antecedent basis noted by the Examiner.

Claims 8-10 recite methods corresponding to apparatus claims 4, 5, and 7, respectively and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons discussed above.

Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested based on the preceding remarks. If at any time the Examiner believes that an interview would be helpful, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 3/13/2006

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Robyn Wagner  
Registration No. 50,575  
V 408-973-2596  
F 408-973-2595

VAN PELT, YI & JAMES LLP  
10050 N. Foothill Blvd., Suite 200  
Cupertino, CA 95014